
Appendix B

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC PROCESS

THIS APPENDIX CONTAINS THE FOLLOWING MATERIALS:

- Overview of public participation process
- Summary of public comments on the public review Draft RMP
- Substantive revisions to the RMP based upon additional DCR staff review
- Summaries of first and second public meetings

OVERVIEW OF PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROCESS

The Chestnut Hill Reservation Resource Management Plan planning process included several opportunities for the public to provide input on the plan including a user survey, public meetings and a public comment period. This was supplemented by regular meetings of the CHR RMP Working Group, a representative body of local organizations, state and municipal government.

Public meetings and open public comment periods were built into the schedule for the RMP from the onset. Public meetings were scheduled to coincide with significant milestones - preliminary findings, draft RMP and final RMP. These meetings were publicized through local newspapers and publicly noticed via the *Environmental Monitor*, a publication of the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act (MEPA) office. Three public meetings were included in the Chestnut Hill RMP planning process.

The public process was supplemented by the CHR RMP Working Group, consisting of representatives from municipal and state government as well as neighborhood groups, civic organizations, and non-profits who share a common interest in the future of the Reservation. Members of the Working Group agreed to help DCR identify preliminary issues, provide guidance on maximizing public involvement, and serve as liaisons to their respective organizations. Over thirty individuals served on the Working Group:

Chestnut Hill Reservation RMP Working Group Members

Aberdeen & Reservoir Civic Association, *Larry Loew, President*
Aberdeen Brighton Residents Association, *Malcolm Johnson*
Allston Brighton Comm. Dev. Corp., *Charlie Vasiliades, Board member*
Allston-Brighton Youth Hockey, *Michael Cashman*
Boston College Task Force, *Joseph Teller*
Brighton-Allston Historical Society, *William Marchione*
Brighton-Allston Improvement Association, *Abigail Furey, President*
Brighton Garden & Horticultural Society, *Wilma Wetterstrom, Vice President*
Brookline Civic Association, *Paul Saner*
Chestnut Hill Association, *Ruthanne Fuller, President*
Chestnut Hill Garden Club, *Carol Post Pfaelzer*
Chestnut Hill Neighborhood Association (Brookline), *Jean Fulkerson*
Chestnut Hill Reservoir Coalition, *Eva Webster, President*
Chestnut Hill Reservoir Community Gardens, *Rita Macmillan, Pat Diamond, Co-Coordination*
Chestnut Hill Waterworks Community Task Force, *Stan Kugell, Steering Committee Member*
Corey Hill Neighborhood Association, *Isabella Hinds*
Fisher Hill Association, *Gill Fishman, Co-President*

Friends of the Houghton Garden, *Michele Hanss*
 Friends of the Waterworks, Inc., *Elaine Pierce*
 Lake, Undine, Calta and Kenrick Street Association, *Mark Alford*
 Reservoir Gardens Condominium Association, *Gerald Collins*
 Salisbury Rd – Corey Farm Neighborhood Association, *Ted Nolte*

Elected Officials

Office of Senator Cynthia Stone Creem, *Josh Krintzman, Legislative Director*
 Office of Representative Frank Smizik, *George Chapman, Legislative Aide*
 Office of Representative Michael J. Moran, *Jay Cincotti*
 Office of Representative Kevin G. Honan
 Office of Senator Steven A. Tolman, *William D. Luzier, General Counsel*
 Office of Jerry McDermott Boston City Council, *Kristin Langone, Policy Advisor*
 Town of Brookline, *Roger Blood*

Public Agencies

Department of Conservation & Recreation, *Wendy Pearl, Project Manager*
 Department of Conservation & Recreation, *Kevin Hollenbeck, Supervisor, Chestnut Hill Reservation*
 Department of Conservation & Recreation, *Leslie Luchonok, Director, RMP Program*
 Division of Capital Asset Management, *Melissa Robin, Project Director, Office of Real Property*
 Executive Office of Environmental Affairs, *Betsy Shure Gross, Executive Director, Office of Public Private Partnerships*
 Massachusetts Historical Commission, *Brona Simon, Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer*
 Massachusetts Water Resources Authority, *Marianne Connolly, Program Manager*
 Boston Conservation Commission, *Chris Busch, Acting Executive Secretary*
 Boston Parks and Recreation Department, *Brian McLaughlin, Executive Secretary*
 Boston Redevelopment Authority, *Joe Lawler*
 Boston Redevelopment Authority, *Jill Ochs Zick, Landscape Architect*
 Mayor's Office of Neighborhood Services, *Paul Holloway, Allston / Brighton Neighborhood Coordinator*

Non - Profits

Boston College, *Thomas J. Keady, Jr., Vice President*
 Boston GreenSpace Alliance, *Peter Bowne, Executive Director*

Local Businesses

Brighton Main Streets, *Rosie Hanlon, Executive Director*
 Cleveland Circle Association LP, *Bob Marks, Founder*
 Diamond|Sinacori, *Merrill H. Diamond, Principal*

MEETING SCHEDULE

The Chestnut Hill RMP kicked off in January 2005 with the first meeting of the CHRMP Working Group, whose input led to the draft Vision Statement for the reservation and a plan for public process. In May 2005 DCR engaged the services of a professional consultant team, led by Pressley Associates, Inc. who met with the Working Group in September 2005. The first Public Meeting for the Chestnut Hill RMP took place on November 29, 2005 and was well-attended. Following a brief overview of the project goals, issues and opportunities, staff from DCR and Pressley Associates fielded questions and listened to the residents' concerns. The comments from that meeting helped to prioritize recommendations and complete the draft RMP.

DCR maintained a regular schedule of both Working Group and public meetings, involving over two hundred individuals in the RMP process as follows:

Meeting Type	RMP Milestone	Date	Attendance
Working Group	Kick-off	1/8/05	36
Working Group	Preliminary findings	9/29/05	23
Public Meeting	Preliminary findings	11/29/05	92
Working Group	Draft RMP	4/4/06	12
Public Meeting	Draft RMP	4/25/06	115
Working Group*	Follow up to public comment period	6/19/06	25
Public Meeting	Final Draft RMP	Fall 2006	
DCR Stewardship Council ¹	Final RMP	Fall 2006	

USER SURVEY

The Public Process for the Chestnut Hill Reservation Resource Management Plan also included a User Survey. The 2002 transfer of the reservation lands from MWRA to the DCR (then MDC) resulted in the Chestnut Hill Reservoir landscape being opened for recreational use after many years of restricted access. To gather more information on park use, DCR solicited comments and gathered data through a User Survey, distributed at public meeting and via the internet between November 2005 and February 2006. Approximately 60 responses were submitted, revealing a typical profile of the Chestnut Hill Reservation visitor. Over half of the responses came from Brighton residents, and nearly 70% of respondents live within 0.5 miles of the Reservation arriving at the reservation on foot. Walking is the most popular activity, followed by running, birding, and dog walking. The vast majority of users visit the Reservation at least once each week. The path around the reservoir and views within the reservation are the favorite features. People also enjoy the natural woodland provided by the park. The survey also provided information on areas where DCR could improve management, including increased presence of safety personnel and improved visibility on pathways, improvements to the path surface and better trash removal. Respondents indicated that the priorities for capital investment were the 1929 fence (removal, replacement or repair) and improving the reservoir (perimeter) path.

The information collected through the User Survey was used to develop the draft RMP.

PUBLIC MEETINGS

A public meeting to present preliminary findings and solicit input on issues and topics to be addressed in the RMP was held in November 2005. Approximately ninety individuals representing the surrounding neighborhoods, community groups and local and state government attended. Notice of the public meeting was provided through press releases to local media, communication with area legislators, and notices sent to community groups through the Working Group liaisons.

The Draft Resource Management Plan was completed and issued for public comment on March 22, 2006. Consistent with RMP legislation, Chapter 26 Acts of 2003, the draft was available for public comment for a 45-day period ending on May 5, 2006. The draft RMP was posted on the DCR website and noticed in the *Environmental Monitor*. DCR also issued a press release to the local papers announcing the availability of the draft and the date and time of the public meeting.

¹ * The June Working Group meeting was open to the public, and the DCR Stewardship Council meetings are open to the public. The date, time and location of the Stewardship meeting to vote on the Chestnut Hill Reservation RMP will be posted on the DCR website.

During the comment period DCR convened the Working Group to present the draft plan. Although many members praised the detail and thoroughness of the plan, it was clear that many recommendations and statements were not fully supported by the group. Recommendations regarding parking, the Community Gardens, the treatment of the fence and the order of priority improvements were opposed by the majority. The outcome of the meeting was that the Working Group members would meet to develop a joint comment letter, representing most of the community groups surrounding Chestnut Hill Reservation. Notes from the WG meeting of April 4, 2006 are included in this appendix and the comments from the WG comment letter are included in the summary below.

DCR held a second general public meeting during the public comment period for the Draft RMP. Held on April 25, 2006 at the Circle Cinemas, the public meeting drew a crowd of over 110 people, many of whom came to express opposition to the recommendation to reduce parking along Chestnut Hill Driveway. Following a presentation by DCR, participants were provided an opportunity to speak on microphone or submit written questions and comments on note cards. The majority of comments related to parking and the gardens, opposing the elimination of either feature on the Driveway. Notes from the public meeting are included in this appendix.

The Department of Conservation and Recreation received 89 written comments regarding the Draft Chestnut Hill Reservation Resource Management Plan (RMP). Eighteen members of the Working Group signed on to a joint comment letter, subsequently endorsed by other WG members and individuals. The public comment period also encouraged many to write to their state legislators. Representative Michael J. Moran and Senator Steven A. Tolman submitted letters expressing the concerns of their constituents. The Boston Landmarks Commission and the Massachusetts Historical Commission submitted extensive comments on an earlier version of the draft RMP as well. DCR and the consultant team evaluated all comments, and revised the draft plan in preparation for a public presentation in September 2006. Following the public presentation the final Draft RMP will be submitted to the DCR Stewardship Council.

Names of individuals, organizations, and officials who submitted comments are listed at the end of this appendix. Comments have been summarized below.

OVERVIEW OF PUBLIC COMMENTS AND SUBSTANTIVE CHANGES TO THE RMP

(see also the Summary of Public Comments below for more detail)

DCR appreciates the high level of participation in this RMP planning process through which the agency has received 89 written comment letters/emails and various comments at the two, well-attended public meetings. In general, comments on the draft RMP were thoughtful and specific, and seem to be a good representation of the public's interests and concerns at Chestnut Hill Reservation. Several commenters commend the extent and quality of the research and analysis represented by the draft RMP, including its analysis of plants and animals. Many individual letters related to the draft recommendations regarding the parking area on Chestnut Hill Driveway and the Community Gardens, two resources which are clearly valued by the community (see below for DCR response). Many also see a need for more a more detailed plan for the management of heritage trees, invasive species, and other vegetation. The Chestnut Hill RMP Working Group submitted a joint comment letter which included their versions of both a Vision Statement and an approach to land management, among many other detailed comments. Several legislators also submitted comments. This public input has challenged DCR to make the RMP more reflective of the community's needs as well as more descriptive in its justification for certain management decisions. The specific responses, summarized by topic, follow.

Summary of Comments on the Public Draft RMP, DCR Responses and Substantive Revisions to the RMP

DCR received 89 written comments on the draft RMP through email, fax and surface mail. These comments have been synthesized and summarized below, organized by thematic topic. Following each issue the DCR response, including substantive changes to the RMP are noted.

Vision

Summary of public comments

The Working Group joint letter describes a “Community Vision” for Chestnut Hill Reservation that they feel should guide the RMP, especially the Recommendations & Implementation sections. It differs from the vision statement in the draft RMP, giving more emphasis to the maintenance of existing uses. Their vision states that interests of passive-recreational users and residential neighbors should factor heavily into decisions; and historic preservation, maintenance, ADA and private and/or institutional goals should be “sensitive to and compatible with objectives of general public use and enjoyment”.

DCR response and RMP revisions

The Vision Statement for Chestnut Hill Reservation included in the Draft RMP was based on the results of the January 2005 Workshop at which many Working Group members provided input. This statement was presented at public meeting in November 2005 and has served as the basis for this RMP. The DCR Vision statement imparts an equal level of importance to use, historic preservation, access and sustainability, and directs management toward balancing these needs. This approach ensures that the Resource Management Plan supports the management of all of the resources of the Reservation. The Vision Statement will remain unchanged.

Public Outreach

Summary of public comments

Many people noted DCR’s willingness to work with the community and the agency’s efforts at outreach, but some felt that the agency could have done more to inform residents and neighbors. One comment indicated that resident input was not actively solicited and that the proposal (RMP) was “buried” on DCR website. It was also noted that the User Survey did not adequately address parking. With 90% of users living within ½ mile of the reservation, it was suggested that DCR take a walk through with ‘select area residents’ to discuss issues.

DCR response and RMP revisions

The public process carried out for the draft Chestnut Hill RMP is consistent with that used for other RMP projects and included two general public meetings and three meetings of the Working Group. Public meetings were noticed in the MEPA *Environmental Monitor* as required by the RMP legislation, and press releases were sent to the local papers. The *Allston Brighton TAB* published meetings notices as well as several articles on the RMP process.

Clarifications

Chestnut Hill Park

Summary of public comments

In common local usage, the term “Chestnut Hill Park” refers to the area behind the Reilly Rink & Pool. The draft RMP refers the northern parcel containing the Chestnut Hill Driveway as such. The plan should be clear and consistent when using this language.

DCR response and RMP revisions

It seems that both the area behind the Rink/Pool and the northern edge along Chestnut Hill Driveway have historically been called “Chestnut Hill Park.” In fact, all of the parkland surrounding the two basins of the original Chestnut Hill Reservoir was called “Chestnut Hill Park,” including the parcel where Cassidy Playground now stands. Ownership of the

lands surrounding the Reservoir changed from the City of Boston to the Commonwealth through several transfers. The 1976 transfer of care, custody and control of the 17.55 acre northern parcel references a plan entitled “Plan of Land, Chestnut Hill Park, Brighton, MA” which is why that parcel goes by that name in the draft RMP. In the plan the area behind Reilly Rink is described as both the “Drumlin” and the “area behind Reilly Rink.” For clarity and consistency, the RMP will not reference “Chestnut Hill Park”. Instead, the parcels will be referred to as “the Driveway” and “the area behind the Rink/Pool.”

Cleveland Circle Streetscape Plan

Summary of public comments

The draft RMP incorrectly references the source of the Cleveland Circle Streetscape Plan. The plan was funded by two legislative appropriations and Boston College. The design and final report for public art installation were completed, and the plan included a gateway element connecting Cleveland Circle with the playground (Cassidy).

DCR response and RMP revisions

References to the Cleveland Circle Streetscape Plan will be amended to correctly reflect the funding sources and partners on that plan.

Other Clarifications

Regulatory Process

At the time of MHC’s review, the draft RMP was in an early form, and the MHC recommended that the plan include further detail on regulatory compliance. The draft RMP issued for public comment included this information as part of Chapter 4 “Resource Protection Guidelines and Regulatory Procedures.”

Lease areas

The parcels surrounding Shaft 7 are not leased from the Commonwealth to Boston College. The plan should state that they are licensed to BC.

Natural Resources

Vegetation Management

Summary of Public Comments

Comments reveal that the Reservation is viewed as a ‘natural oasis’ and should be managed to protect native species and preserve the sense of ‘peaceful isolation’ from the adjacent urban area. This should include the use of vegetation to screen incompatible views such as the skating rink and pool.

Comments on vegetation management generally relate to the poor visual quality of the reservation (resulting from a lack of basic maintenance), dangers from falling tree branches and branches that obstruct the paths, and visibility for personal safety. Many commenters supported the development of a Vegetation Management Plan to outline specific ways to address these important issues.

Vegetation Management Plan

Many comments support the creation of a Vegetation Management Plan (VMP) as an urgent priority. The VMP would address issues of appropriate vista management, screening incompatible elements (i.e. Rink/Pool), management of woodlands, “Chestnut Hill Park” (area behind rink/pool), control of invasive species (both land and water-based), and plantings. It was noted that the development of the VMP could be carried out as the Early Action project under the current consultant contract, perhaps with phased implementation to first address safety issues, then to implement a comprehensive plan over the longer term.

Some areas for new plantings mentioned in the comment letter are Beacon Street, St. Thomas More Road across from the BC athletic complex, and along Chestnut Hill Avenue at the Reilly Pool.

The wooded areas adjacent to the cemetery need maintenance; this should be included in Vegetation Management Plan.

The Working Group noted that “Chestnut Hill Park” (area behind skating rink) has great potential for expanding CHR’s natural and recreational value. The underutilized and neglected area is currently a “near jungle”, and immediate removal of overgrown understory vegetation is recommended. Evergreen vegetation and other plantings could be used to screen the swimming pool and the skating rink

Monitoring

Comments indicate a need to monitor the vegetation at the Reservation including the effects of mowing on wildflowers and the progress of invasive species.

Invasive Species

There should be a treatment plan for invasives – purple loosestrife beetle mentioned as possible solution. One commenter identified the two most visible invasive species as Canada geese and domestic mute swans. As the geese apparently fly between three water bodies, the reservoir, Chandler Pond and the ‘Dana Brook’ in the Newton Commonwealth Golf Course, the commenter recommended that goose control be coordinated among the three landowners with technical assistance from DCR. Surrounding areas such as Chandler Pond may be good models for managing invasives.

DCR response and RMP revisions

The Draft RMP will more specifically state the need for a Vegetation Management Plan as a priority early action. According to the consultants, Pressley Associates, Inc., a Vegetation Management Plan usually addresses issues of hazard trees, vista clearing, control of invasives, recommended plantings and maintenance. The VMP will also identify areas where vegetative screens are appropriate and to what level they should be managed. DCR has given the consultant a notice to proceed with the development of a VMP following the completion of the RMP, with the intent that the RMP and VMP will be used together to manage the reservation.

The RMP will also be revised to include a recommendation for ongoing monitoring of plants and the effects of mowing and other maintenance practices.

Cultural Resources

Stone walls

Summary of public comments

It was noted that repairs to the historic stone walls along Chestnut Hill Avenue are a more urgent priority than expressed in the draft RMP and that most of these structures need complete repointing to avoid more serious deterioration.

DCR response and RMP revisions

The implementation chapter of the RMP will be revised to elevate the repair of stone walls to a high priority.

Gatehouse #1 Area

Summary of public comments

The rehabilitation of Gatehouse #1 as the main gateway to the Reservation is supported by the public, although it is not seen as an immediate priority. People would like to see an amendment to the 2002 MOA to allow DCR use of the area (visitor parking, community events) and to prevent the MWRA from using the area for construction staging. A phased approach to first stabilize then rehabilitate is recommended. Some possible uses include Ranger Station/Visitor Center, storage, volunteer space.

One individual requested that since MWRA has re-opened its parking lot, the driveway at the pool be fenced to prevent access. Note: Since the draft RMP was issued, the parking at Gatehouse #1 has been closed to allow for a construction staging/laydown area. There were several comments that opposed the use of this area for construction staging.

DCR response and RMP revisions

The implementation plan will be modified to outline a phased approach for the reuse of Gatehouse #1. Phase 1 - negotiation with MWRA for use of the building and immediate stabilization – will be a high priority. Phase 2 - full rehabilitation for a new use - will be a lower priority. The rehabilitation of the Gatehouse and courtyard will include considerations for parking, visitor services and park programs.

Currently under MWRA management, the Gatehouse #1 area will continue to be used for construction through 2007.

Chestnut Hill Driveway

The draft RMP included recommendations related to the entire Chestnut Hill Driveway area, but the vast majority of the public comment was on the issue of parking.

Parking

Summary of public comments

Parking emerged as the single most important issue for the public judging both from the discussion at the public meeting held on April 25, 2006 and from the written comments. Almost every letter that DCR received urged the agency to not eliminate or reduce the parking spaces on the reservoir side of Chestnut Hill Driveway. Two state Representatives and one state Senator submitted letters voicing their constituents' significant concerns. Petitions with approximately 150 signatures expressing opposition to the removal of the public parking on Chestnut Hill Driveway were received by DCR along with numerous phone calls, emails and letters.

There is vehement opposition to any changes in look, character and use of the Chestnut Hill Driveway, and people urge the DCR to carry out only minor maintenance actions. DCR should retain the current configuration and number of parking spaces, as the parking does not interfere with access. Parking issues for residents relate to the efficiency of the parking area (unclear striping) and hours of use (restrictions on nighttime use limit ability to have guests). If any changes are made people expect that those changes will support the use of the parking area by nearby residents (which some claim is a historic use).

According to most commenters, parking in the area is very difficult, with street parking very limited and sometimes only available on unsafe parts of city streets. Safety was cited by many commenters as a reason to keep the existing parking. Some noted that additional parking should be available near Cleveland Circle.

Some commenters cited conditions outside of DCR's management that strain the neighborhood parking situation – BC athletic events, snow emergencies, the Boston Marathon, MBTA and utility maintenance and annual relocation of the student population.

Many commenters cited the continued residential development in the Brighton area that further strains the already inadequate parking stock. People are seeing new condo complexes being built, with little or no additional parking. Many residents purchased their homes or took apartments in the area because of the parking, and say they will either lose value in their homes or be forced out if parking is reduced. DCR is expected to manage the existing parking, not remove it. The stated visual intrusion of cars on views from the Reservoir pathway is not an adequate justification for changing the parking as cars are not really noticeable most times of the year.

The damage to the community from removal of parking will outweigh any aesthetic improvements in the Reservation.

DCR response and RMP revisions

Public comments revealed that the loss of residential parking would place a significant burden on residents and the draft RMP did not adequately justify the needs to change the configuration of the Driveway, a significant part of the park landscape. The community has clearly stated that the Driveway is not one of their priority resources. However, DCR's mission to protect cultural, natural and recreational resources applies to the entire reservation, and the Driveway is recognized as an important part of the historic landscape. In response to public comment, the draft RMP will be amended to better describe and analyze the parking issue as it relates to the management of the Chestnut Hill Driveway as a whole, including pedestrian and universal access. The plan will also better represent the significance of the parking area to the neighborhood. The specific recommendation to reduce or remove the parking will be amended to read as follows:

The management of the Chestnut Hill Driveway area will take into consideration the critical need for resident parking, the significance of the Driveway as part of the historic landscape, and the need to provide equal access to the entire Reservation. Specific guidelines for the Driveway are:

- Minimize changes to the parking area and take into consideration residential parking needs including handicap accessible parking requirements.
- Treatment of the parking area should be a part of a larger plan for Chestnut Hill Driveway.
- Provide an accessible route along the Reservoir side of the Driveway as part of a plan to maximize accessibility while balancing historic preservation needs; for example, the historic retaining walls at "dip" should be treated appropriately.
- Maintain some vegetation along the Driveway to screen views of apartment buildings, parking structures, etc. as seen from the Reservoir path to "block the city out."
- Collect traffic volume and speed data to determine whether any traffic calming is needed and what methods would be appropriate along the Driveway.
- Replace granite crosswalks with a more appropriate accessible surface that does not increase the maintenance burden. Remove granite rumble strips and replace with traffic calming features as determined by traffic data (above).
- Select a replacement lighting fixture that is both historically appropriate and as energy efficient as possible.
- Incorporate provisions for recreational use of the woodland buffer, such as public benches and tables.
- Treatment of the Driveway will be in accordance with the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*.

It was also noted that DCR needs to raise public awareness of community benefits from use of DCR parkland and encourage private support for Reservation management. DCR also needs to work with abutters and the City of Boston to maintain those areas that primarily serve property owners and city residents.

Circulation

Vehicular circulation

Summary of public comments

Comments highlighted a number of areas where vehicular circulation could be improved including reconfiguration of the St. Thomas More Road/Beacon Street intersection, a new crosswalk on Beacon Street at Gatehouse #2, and repaving Chestnut Hill Driveway. The "Rumble strips" along the Driveway were also seen as a speed deterrent which should be preserved. The addition of bicycle accommodation along the roadway was also put forward as a means to control speeding cars; for example creating a "Memorial Drive style greenway" to increase pedestrian safety and to slow traffic.

The stretch of St. Thomas More Drive abutting the basin needs trees and a sidewalk. Both should be included in plans for the Reservation's hard outer path. A traffic barrier to protect pedestrians from vehicles may be needed where the road comes closest to basin. Vegetation could be used to screen the barrier.

DCR response and RMP revisions

The RMP includes a recommendation for a sidewalk along St. Thomas More Road as part of the “outer” path system. It is not clear whether a traffic barrier is necessary in this location, given the proximity of the sidewalk to the road in other locations (i.e. Beacon Street). In the case of comments related to City of Boston streets, requests for street improvements (crosswalks, sidewalks, etc.) will be forwarded to the City for their consideration.

Pedestrian circulation**Summary of public comments**

A number of people noted that a dual pathway system, consisting of an inner (‘perimeter’) and an outer path through the reservation, would be ideal as it would allow for both hard and soft surfaces for different uses. The 1977 improvements at the Reservation included a “jogging track” that encircled the reservation and was paved with a soft material. It was noted that the current inner path is in poor condition, overcrowded and that there is a need to separate slower moving traffic from runners. As a result of conflicts between different types of users, one individual requested that bikes and roller blades be prohibited. The desire for a continuous path around the exterior of the reservation was also noted.

There was support for retaining and improving the dual path system and for a commitment to snow removal to allow for winter running. An outer path could have a hard surface to enable plowing, while the inner (perimeter) path would remain soft and unplowed in winter. Removal of the iron fence would allow construction of hard outer path immediately next to a soft inner pathway. A grassy median could be used to separate inner and outer path system where space allows.

DCR should maintain the paths behind the skating rink (“Chestnut Hill Park”), with some paving or regrading needed. Desire paths such as that from the rink to the basin (past the playground) should be paved.

There is a pedestrian problem where the sidewalk along Beacon Street suddenly ends. The paved sidewalk should continue along Beacon Street, St. Thomas More Drive and Chestnut Hill Driveway.

The addition of a pedestrian pathway from the pull-out parking area on Chestnut Hill Driveway into the inner (Reservoir) pathway is not supported. The Working Group expressed concern that such a change (new pathway and “Open Park” setting) would threaten natural habitat. The WG notes that this connection from the Driveway to the inner path is not needed since the entrance at Chestnut Hill Ave is closer for the Commonwealth Ave residents.

DCR response and RMP revisions

Many of the public comments relate to the design of the rehabilitated reservoir pathway which is not a part of the RMP. The intent of the draft recommendation was to identify the pathway rehabilitation as a priority and outline a possible treatment. When the project moves forward, the design will have to take into consideration current user needs, accessibility, safety, historic context and maintenance capacity. The design process would include consideration for additional sidewalk on DCR roads (St. Thomas More Drive and the Driveway) as well as consultation with the City of Boston regarding sidewalks along their streets (Chestnut Hill Avenue and Beacon Street).

The proposed configuration of the pathways behind the Rink/Pool is meant to illustrate how the existing path network might be simplified to make clearer connections to city sidewalks and the Reservoir pathway, improve accessibility, and streamline maintenance. When the existing path system was developed, the Reservoir pathway was inaccessible. This forced a high level of active recreation into the small area behind the rink/pool. The path system was also designed to link a series of exercise stations as well as provide for pedestrian access. With the Reservoir pathways now open and the exercise stations gone, there is no longer a need to compress the path network into this small area, creating an opportunity to streamline the paths and decrease the amount of paved woodland. The RMP will be amended to include the short-term, high priority of maintaining the existing pathways for safe use along with the longer term recommendation for updating the path network.

The dual path system implemented in 1977 was a direct response to the need to provide recreational access during times of limited access to the inner reservoir pathway. With those restrictions lifted, there is an opportunity to provide the same access with less infrastructure. The RMP recommendation will be amended to be clear regarding the overall circulation system and its various components and a circulation graphic will be added, but the 1977 “jogging path” will not be restored. The RMP recommends the installation of a combined hard and soft path only in the location where no sidewalk exists.

Site furnishings and small scale features

Fence

Summary of public comments

The primary concern mentioned by residents was the visual impact of the existing 1928-1929 iron fence on the reservation as a public landscape. In some areas, fencing is seen as useful as a tool to insure safety (along the Driveway or in areas to separate pedestrian and vehicular traffic). However, a very long stretch of the most visible part of the fence (along Beacon Street) is in very poor condition, representing extreme neglect of the reservation and creating an unwelcome feeling and the sense that the park may be dangerous. Long stretches of high fencing, particularly atop the dam, present walkers with few opportunities to exit the perimeter pathway, contributing to an unsafe atmosphere. Many commenters, including the majority of the Working Group members, support full removal of the fence, indicating that higher priorities should take precedence (vegetation, path rehab, masonry repairs). If a barrier along Beacon Street is needed, many would prefer other materials such as a wood rail fence or shrubs that would control access and potentially reduce maintenance by making mowing under the fence easier.

Gates in the fences at Gatehouse #1 and #2 should be unlocked.

Additional public process

Following the public comment period and the public meeting, DCR convened the Working Group to further discuss the issues of parking and the fence. At the Working Group meeting, there was little or no support for the draft recommendation. It was stated that the community wants the fence removed and no other treatment is acceptable.

Consideration of alternatives

Some have asked the DCR to consider replacing the existing fence with alternate barriers such as a wooden rail fence like the one shown in historic photos (c.1876), or shrubs, or a combination thereof. Under the 20002 agreement between the MWRA and DCR, MWRA has management control of the dam structure. They have indicated that any plantings on the dam or at the toe of the dam slope would not be acceptable, so the shrub option is not feasible. It is also unlikely that plantings would provide an adequate barrier to prevent access up the slope. Replacement of the existing fence with another type of fence is also not appropriate. Reconstruction of features is an acceptable preservation treatment when a property has suffered the loss of a character-defining feature like a fence. However, the preservation treatment at Chestnut Hill Reservation is one of rehabilitation. Under that treatment, even deteriorated features can only be replaced if the replacement matches the old in design, color, texture, and materials. The replacement of the existing iron fence is only appropriate under the restoration treatment, which aims to represent a landscape at a specific period of time. If this treatment were applied to Chestnut Hill Reservation, later alterations such as the Reilly Pool/Rink and changes to the Driveway (i.e. parking, scenic overlook, gardens) would be removed.

Options discussed:

1. Partial removal of the fence as outlined in the Draft Resource Management Plan.
2. Removal of the 1928-1929 fencing and installation of a reproduction wood rail fence in areas where access control is needed.
3. Removal of the 1928-1929 fencing and installation of shrubs in areas where access control is needed.

The WG and DCR developed a list of “Criteria for Success” regarding the fence which are:

- Meet DCR’s need for management control along the slope to prevent desire paths and erosion
- Eliminate the “keep out” feeling and send a more welcoming message to the public
- Successful consultation and/or approvals from the regulatory authorities including MWRA, the manager of the dam

The community does not agree that a fence is needed to control access on the slope of the dam, a need that has been strongly supported by DCR field staff. This inherent conflict in assumptions prevents DCR from developing a solution that will meet both the community’s and the agency’s goals.

DCR response and RMP revisions

In response to the community’s concerns regarding the 1928-1929 fence, DCR investigated options for the treatment of the fence. Based on the public comment, ongoing collaboration with the Working Group, and further analysis, DCR has determined that the Beacon Street edge of the Reservation (from Gatehouse #1 to St. Thomas More Drive) is a unique part of the historic landscape. It is the public face of the reservation and the site of the most significant intact waterworks features – the dam, Gatehouse #1 and Gatehouse #2. The significant resources, high visibility and visual link to the Waterworks facilities across the street make restoration more appropriate than rehabilitation for the area.

Restoration is a preservation treatment that focuses on the resources associated with a certain time period and “brings the property back” to that time based on photographs, plans and other sources. In the case of the Beacon Street edge of Chestnut Hill Reservation, DCR would aim to restore the landscape to the primary period of significance related to the Water Supply of Boston era (1868-1926), specifically the date of 1901 when major construction at the facility ended. This treatment will include the removal of features built after that time period, including the iron fence and gates. It is important to note that, without the fence, the slope of the dam will be open to pedestrian and bicycle traffic. DCR will work with MWRA to monitor the effects of uncontrolled access on the integrity of the dam structure, but the MWRA will retain authority over the dam, reserving the right to protect the structure if adverse effects are apparent.

DCR will explore two parallel avenues for the removal of the 1928-1929 fence in its entirety. First, DCR will file all appropriate documentation with both the Massachusetts Historical Commission and the Boston Landmarks Commission. These regulatory reviews will determine whether any additional documentation or formal mitigation is needed to satisfy compliance with local and state law. Second, DCR will develop a scope of work and estimate and then work with park partners to identify sources for funding the fence removal as an early action priority. When this process is complete the recommendation for the treatment of the fence (including required documentation or mitigation) will be finalized, and incorporated into the final draft Resource Management Plan.

The scope for the fence removal may include:

- Removal, documentation, mothballing and storage of fence, posts and gates; private, off-site storage facility to be determined;
- Design and construction of historically appropriate vehicular gate/control at gate west of Gatehouse #2;
- Documentation or other mitigation as required by the Boston Landmarks Commission and the Massachusetts Historical Commission;
- All of the above to be carried out in accordance with *Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*.

Because DCR jointly manages Chestnut Hill Reservation with the Massachusetts Water Resource Authority (MWRA) the treatment of the fence will also include the following provisions:

- MWRA has first option for reuse of salvaged fence as outlined in the 2002 management agreement;
- Uncontrolled access along slope of dam will be monitored (by DCR, MWRA and park partners);
- MWRA reserves the right to protect the dam if adverse effects are seen

Lighting

Summary of public comments

Although replacement of the existing “cobra head” street lights is not seen as an urgent priority, many commenters agree that a more historically appropriate light fixture would be an improvement along St. Thomas More Road and Chestnut Hill Driveway. The fixtures should be consistent with those installed by the City of Boston along Beacon Street, and care should be taken to avoid excessive light pollution, increased operational costs, and a decrease in security.

One commenter suggested the installation of footlights on the park pathways.

DCR response and RMP revisions

The RMP recommendation for street lighting will be amended to include consideration of light pollution, energy efficiency, cost, security and consistency with other street lighting in the area.

As stated in park regulations, Chestnut Hill Reservation is not open at night, so no path lighting is proposed.

Signage

Summary of public comments

Comments stressed the importance of signage to inform the public about the availability of amenities (restrooms, food, and community meeting areas) as well as the need to post Park User Rules at all major gateways. Signage could also be used to tie in the Reservation with the museum/café to be developed at the Waterworks site. DCR should install signs commemorating the Reservoir’s history (subject to available funding).

DCR response and RMP revisions

The RMP will be amended to include references to the Waterworks development museum and café, with a recommendation that any signage within the Reservation relate back to those public spaces, both through design and directional text. A recommendation for developing an interpretive plan for the facility is already included in the plan.

Playground

Summary of public comment

Although the poor condition of the playground was noted by some commenters, the recommendation to remove the playground was not supported. Of the limited number of letters that mentioned the playground, most ask that DCR replace the playground. Also, DCR should prune trees to allow more light into the area. The playground renovation is seen by some as a higher priority than the Gatehouse #1 project.

DCR response and RMP revisions

The existing playground consists of an abandoned rockpile (formerly a play structure), paving, 1977 fencing, a retaining wall and benches. In fall 2006 DCR’s certified Playground Inspector inspected the existing play area. Based on the federal guidelines for playground safety *Standard Consumer Safety Performance Specification for Playground Equipment for Public Use*, US Consumer Products Safety Commission’s *Handbook for Public Playground Safety*, and other data from manufacturers, the Inspector determined that the existing structure and ground materials are unsafe, presenting a public safety hazard. He also determined that the mound cannot be safely rehabilitated to meet current safety guidelines and should be removed immediately. Given current resources allocated for the management of Chestnut Hill Reservation as well as limited area, a new playground may not be a sustainable improvement and may be better sited elsewhere.

The draft RMP recommendation to remove the playground will remain with the additional recommendation to conduct a feasibility analysis for constructing a new playground.

Site Amenities

Summary of public comment

Benches along the perimeter path, picnic tables and an increased number of trash cans were all suggested. More frequent and regular emptying of the trash cans was also suggested. Trash barrels are seen as an important component of an urban park, particularly near the Reilly Rink/Pool.

Benches are needed throughout reservation, especially along the sunny northern part of basin. The community is interested in pursuing public-private fund-raising for benches.

One commenter suggested the addition of shelters for reservation use on rainy days.

DCR response and RMP revisions

The installation of benches will be moved into the high priority list under the implementation chapter, and a recommendation for bench style with costs will be included to facilitate fundraising. DCR has also investigated a number of bench donation programs which may serve as a model for a program at Chestnut Hill.

Until staffing levels change, the current number of trash cans will remain at the Reservation.

The construction of new shelters along the Reservoir path would significantly impact the historic character of the Reservoir landscape. The RMP recommends the adaptive reuse of Gatehouse #1 which would provide shelter for park users during rainstorms.

Community Garden

Summary of public comments

Comments related to the Reservoir Community Garden were unanimously in favor of maintaining the status quo. Many commenters were writing to express opposition to the removal of the gardens, citing the benefits of gardening, healthy eating, social interaction, community building, aesthetic appeal, environmental awareness, etc. The gardens have been in this location for over 30 years and are seen as an integral part of the Reservation. A number of individuals also suggested that the community gardens would be enhanced if water was available earlier in the season and if the gardens were irrigated.

The history of the gardens was also further delineated through public comment. The organization dates back to the WWII Victory Garden which used to be at corner of Commonwealth Avenue and Chestnut Hill Avenue. The original site was sold by the City for construction of large building, and the current plot was given as a substitute. The gardens are seen as an attraction, maintaining property values. Brighton has the fewest community gardens in the City.

DCR should create a legal agreement to ensure the continued viability of the Community Gardens. Additional fencing may help to protect the gardens, and a water supply is needed.

DCR response and RMP revisions

The text describing the Community Gardens will be changed to better reflect the history of the gardens in Brighton and more fully account for their present location within the Reservation. In addition, the recommendation for the gardens will be revised as follows:

Negotiate a formal agreement with the Community Gardens which resolves issues of maintenance, public benefit, liability and access (membership). Such an agreement should be consistent with those in place for the community gardens at other DCR facilities.

Management Resources

Snow removal

Summary of public comments

Many commenters noted that an outer paved path should be maintained and cleared of snow to allow pedestrian access during winter months.

DCR response and RMP revisions

DCR will continue its current practice of snow removal on city sidewalks abutting the Reservation, DCR roadways and a portion of the existing reservoir pathway along Beacon Street where no sidewalk exists. DCR will also work with the City of Boston to insure that city sidewalks are maintained and, where appropriate, extended to facilitate pedestrian use.

Snow removal along the full length of the reservoir (inner) pathway is not recommended as the pathway has been, and was historically, a soft surface which is not suitable for plowing. The design for the rehabilitated pathways will take into consideration the various uses (see Pedestrian Circulation above) and snow removal needs.

Recreational Use

Summary of public comments

DCR is asked to consider limiting uses such as roller blades and bicycles that might conflict with walking and running on the inner path. Others have noted an opportunity to organize running events or other recreational programs. DCR should post distances on the pathway.

DCR response and RMP revisions

No limitations on park use are included in the RMP. However, it is recommended that DCR monitor the impact of bicycles on the soft surfaced pathways and consider restrictions if adverse impacts are observed.

Running events would be considered for Chestnut Hill Reservation provided they are approved by Division of Urban Parks and Recreation (DUPR) staff and a DCR permit is granted.

DCR recognizes the need to inform users of the path distances, but on-site markers are not recommended. Distances would be included in the gateway signage and in a reservation brochure.

Enforcement

Summary of public comments

Dogs - One individual noted that the presence of a large number of dogs off-leash made it difficult to enjoy the reservoir peacefully. The hiring of a ranger to patrol the area was suggested. It was also noted that owners must pick up after their dogs.

Speeding cars - Rumble strips or some other speed deterrent are necessary along Chestnut Hill Driveway, and the parking is seen as a speed deterrent itself. DCR should enforce traffic rules and speed limits.

DCR response and RMP revisions

The RMP will identify areas where additional enforcement of existing regulations is necessary and ask for assistance from enforcement personnel.

Surrounding Land Uses

Summary of public comments

A number of individuals noted their unhappiness with Boston College as a neighbor. Concerns included long-term parking, littering, drunkenness and vandalism. It was also stated that BC students should have to park on campus to ease the parking constraints in the neighborhood. Some residents are concerned that the Cleveland Circle area and the Reservation are viewed as gateways to BC - the area should not be an extension of the college campus.

While a formal maintenance agreement with Boston College is needed for St. Thomas More Road, this may require some upfront capital investment by DCR (i.e. replace dead trees).

Potential uses for the area behind Reilly Rink/Pool should be included in the RMP.

There should be involvement from city and state officials when reviewing or formalizing agreements related to the management of Chestnut Hill Park (the 99-year lease area).

DCR response and RMP revisions

The public comments are noted and will be considered in future negotiations with abutters.

It is likely that any change in the status of the 99-year lease parcel would be subject to both local and state review.

Operations Plan

Summary of public comments

The Working Group expressed concern regarding the operational priorities of DCR. The draft RMP stated that Chestnut Hill Reservation is a low priority for staffing and funding because of its size and use. The WG urges DCR to look at CHR as a “heavily used urban park surrounded by intensely developed, densely populated neighborhoods, and adjacent to a major institution of higher learning” and as the “face of the Commonwealth” when making decisions about resources. The comment letter also stated that the unique character, location and historic status should be taken into account, not just its size relative to other DCR facilities.

The WG agrees that the current level of staffing is not adequate. They prefer Level 3 staffing, but if that is not achievable then the level 2 staffing should include more people at the “bottom” (i.e. more seasonal laborers) to keep up with maintenance.

DCR response and RMP revisions

In the current operational organization of the Division of Urban Parks and Recreation, allocation of resources must address priority public safety needs first. Large recreational facilities with swimming and camping must be staffed at higher levels to protect the public. Until the organizational structure changes or staffing across the Division is significantly increased, Chestnut Hill Reservation will remain a lower priority for staffing and other resources.

The recommended staffing for Level 2 is based on the experience and expertise of DCR’s professional staff and will remain unchanged.

Implementation Strategy (comments on priorities, funding, schedule, etc.)

Summary of public comments

It is clear from the comment letters that support from the abutters is critical to the implementation of the RMP recommendations. The process may even result in a “Friends of Chestnut Hill Reservation” group. There is potential to use Trust funds for improvements at the Reservation.

DCR should keep in mind the relationship between the Reservation and the public museum/café space in High Service Building (Hall of Machines). Signage and other improvements at the Reservation should direct visitors to the museum, café, restrooms and programs. The space may also be available for public meetings.

There may be funding from the Waterworks development public benefit funds, but all contributions must be matched by the Commonwealth through the Office of Public Private Partnerships. The BRA has approved the allocation of other public benefits monies for replacing street lights along Beacon Street and installing trees at Cleveland Circle.

Top priorities for early action are removal of the 1928-1929 fence, restoration of the inner path, and development of a Vegetation Management Plan.

Priorities

The joint letter from members of the Working Group highlighted areas where the priorities presented in the draft RMP differ from the immediate needs of the community. Their preferred priorities for the Reservation are (in order):

1. Landscape stabilization (Veg. Mgmt. Plan, pruning, invasive species control, selective clearing and replacement planting, hazardous tree removal)
2. Regrading and surface treatment of perimeter path
3. Stabilization of Gatehouse #1 (without revitalization)
4. Stone wall repair (Chestnut Hill Avenue and entry walls)
5. Removal and off-site storage of 1928-1929 fence
6. Catch basin maintenance
7. Reconstruction of the playground
8. General landscaping and tree planting
9. Installation of site amenities (benches, signage)
10. Site work and landscaping around the Rink
11. Site restoration and landscaping at Gatehouse #1
12. Cosmetic treatment for outflow pipe on dam
13. Construction of pedestrian gateways at Reservation entries
14. Accessible paths between Commonwealth Ave and Reilly Rink
15. Replacement of street lights on St. Thomas More Road
16. Full rehabilitation of Gatehouse #1

Several recommendations were listed as “not supported by the community” including 1) renovation and installation of sections of the 1928-1929 fence, and 2) Chestnut Hill Driveway rehabilitation including removal of parking.

DCR response and RMP revisions

The priorities outlined by the Working Group essentially reorganize those recommendations included in the draft RMP, with the addition and/or modification of a few (Removal of fence, reconstruction of the playground, beautification of outflow pipe on dam). The priorities of the RMP will be reorganized to place community priorities, such as installation of benches, at a higher level for implementation. Development of a Vegetation Management Plan has been identified as a critical early action and will be developed following the completion of the RMP.

The RMP Implementation Plan will be amended to reflect the priorities for the community, with the following exceptions:

- Treatment of Chestnut Hill Driveway, per the amended recommendation, will remain on the list as part of the Level 3 management of the facility.
- Beautification of the outflow pipe on the dam will be included, although the treatment will be subject to review and approval by MWRA.
- Reconstruction of the playground will not be included.

The section will also clarify that the high and low categories are based on the urgency of the situation. Public safety and protection of critical, threatened resources is a higher priority than enhancement activities such as adaptive reuse, although both are essential to the successful management of the reservation.

Note: DCR convened the Working Group in a meeting that was open to the public to discuss criteria for moving forward relative to the 1928-1929 fence and parking on Chestnut Hill Driveway. The outcome of that meeting and the DCR response is included above under “Parking” and “The Fence.”

Substantive Revisions to the RMP Based upon Additional DCR Staff Review

The section of the plan on potential partnerships is not specific enough to provide guidance to would-be partners. The RMP was modified to expand this section with concrete examples and specific recommendations.

Chestnut Hill Driveway

Given the change in the recommendation for the Chestnut Hill Driveway area outlined above, DCR staff recommend the following be added to the RMP:

- DCR should work with the City of Boston to identify ways in which the City might assist with the maintenance (striping, sweeping) of the Driveway in consideration of the parking benefit provided to city residents within the Reservation.
- The parking area should be re-striped in the existing configuration. Future maintenance of the parking area should include provisions for accessible parking spaces, as none currently exist in the Reservation.

During the course of developing this RMP, DCR determined that parking restrictions in the head-in spaces along Chestnut Hill Driveway are not necessary, and snow emergency signs will be removed from the parking area. Signs will be maintained and restrictions enforced along the remainder of the Driveway.

The parking lot was restriped during the course of developing the RMP.

Partnership opportunities

The Draft RMP did not adequately describe the types of public-private partnerships or other models of stewardship that might be applicable to the Chestnut Hill Reservation. Given the large number of active advocacy groups in the area, the RMP should be as specific as possible and provide direct guidance to potential partners. DCR will work with the EOE Office of Public Private Partnerships to amend the RMP to more fully articulate partnership opportunities.

Implementation Plan

The Implementation Plan focuses primarily on capital projects. The RMP should be amended to better outline steps toward implementing management recommendations, such as enforcement, maintenance agreements with abutters and formalizing agreements relative to special use areas (i.e. the Gardens).

Regulatory Coordination

DCR has also consulted with the Massachusetts Historical Commission, the Boston Landmarks Commission, and the Boston Redevelopment Authority to insure consistency with state and local regulations governing the treatment of the reservation. The draft RMP was also provided to staff of the Boston Conservation Commission, from which no comments were received. Other comments on the draft RMP are as follows:

Boston Landmarks Commission

Summary of Comments

The BLC complimented the DCR on the “careful and comprehensive” draft RMP, noting that the plan will preserve the Reservation’s historic character & enhance compatible uses. The BLC also noted that the plan is the most comprehensive compilation of historical data to date. Many of the BLC’s comments related to clarifications including references to Brown as the City Architect, missing dates, the Waterworks development project, and the significance of the landscape as recognized in the BLC’s study report. The BLC will work with DCR as it develops and implements the recommended further studies and early action items.

DCR response and RMP revisions

All clarifications requested by the BLC have been made in the revised RMP.

Massachusetts Historical Commission

Summary of Comments

The Massachusetts Historical Commission concurs with the plan’s use of the *Secretary of the Interior’s Standards* and agrees that the Standards for Rehabilitation are most applicable to the Reservation. While the MHC will review proposed capital improvements and work items outlined in RMP, the recommendations are generally in keeping with the Standards. The MHC states that wooded areas in the vicinity of Wade Street & Chestnut Hill Driveway should be emphasized as buffer zones that protect and enhance feeling of reservation. The plan’s attention to controlling invasives and denotation of areas as “Woodland Management Zones” support this goal. MHC also concurs that Gatehouse #1 is an important historic building in need of immediate capital repairs and advises that DCR develop a maintenance plan and budget to protect the building. The MHC further states that the proposal to remove any part of the 1928-1929 iron fence would constitute an “adverse effect,” requiring further consultation with the MHC. The MHC requests the opportunity to comment on the final RMP prior to publication.

DCR response and RMP revisions

DCR will incorporate the MHC’s comments relative to the protection and treatment of the landscape and buildings at the reservation. DCR is also committed to a consultation process with the MHC for any activities at the reservation. The Public Review Draft RMP included a full chapter on regulatory procedures in response to the MHC comments.

Boston Redevelopment Authority

Summary of comments

The BRA wrote to further clarify the credit for the Cleveland Circle Streetscape Plan which was not funded by the BRA. DCR was also encouraged to work with the Boston Transportation Department (BTD) regarding any recommendations for Chestnut Hill Driveway. It was noted that although the Driveway is under the “care, custody and control” of DCR, it is still an integral part of the Brighton street and traffic patterns. DCR thanks the BRA for also providing additional information regarding the origin of the Reservoir Community Gardens, including a transcript of the Boston Parks Commission meeting in September 1975 at which the Commissioners indicated that the “Victory Gardens” should be maintained in any transfer of the land to the former MDC (a stipulation that was not carried over into the actual lease agreement).

DCR response and RMP revisions

In response to the BRA’s comments, DCR staff met with the Boston Transportation Department to review municipal transportation concerns related to Chestnut Hill Driveway. The BTD clarified that the Driveway is considered a local

roadway (as opposed to an arterial or collector) but is maintained by the Commonwealth. The BTD would not support any reduction in the number of parking spaces along the Driveway as they recognize a substantial need for residential parking in that area.

Information provided by the BRA relating to the history of the gardens will be incorporated into the RMP.

Summary of Public Meetings

PUBLIC MEETING #1

LOCATION: Circle Cinemas

DATE: November 29, 2005

PRESENT: Wendy Pearl, DCR, Project Manager; Leslie Luchonok, DCR, Director, Resource Management Program; Stephen H. Burrington, DCR Commissioner; Kevin Hollenbeck, DCR, Supervisor Chestnut Hill Reservation; Lt. Susan Murphy, DCR Ranger; Marion Pressley, Pressley Associates; Gary Claiborne, Pressley Associates; Representative Kevin Honan; Representative Michael Moran; Staff from the Office of Representative Smizik; Staff from the Office of Senator Tolman

OPENING

WENDY PEARL

The meeting began with opening remarks from Wendy Pearl welcoming the public to the meeting. Steve Burrington, DCR Commissioner, was then introduced.

WELCOME BY COMMISSIONER STEPHEN BURRINGTON

Mr. Burrington remarks referred to the Resource Management Plan as a “user manual” to guide the future management and operations of the Reservation. It will become a common reference point going into the future. The RMP will guide everything from daily maintenance in the Reservation to large capitol projects. He stressed the role that the public has in shaping the final product of the RMP. This RMP will be the one of the first of the many RMPs required for all DCR properties. He stated that the DCR is now in a new committed direction that will make the DCR and its operations more transparent and open to the public.

INTRODUCTION TO THE RMP

WENDY PEARL

Wendy Pearl followed Mr. Burrington with a discussion of the meeting agenda, the RMP process, the project schedule, and the basic ground rules for discussion following the presentation. She also invited members of the Working Group to stand.

The goal of the RMP is balance – recreation, natural resources, historic resources – and sustainability

The Resource Management Plan will be a tool for the future management of Chestnut Hill Reservation and will help to:

- Define a vision for the park
- Describe management goals that balance recreation, natural and historic resource protection
- Identify actions to achieve specific goals
- Lay the groundwork for sustainable maintenance and operations
- Bring communities together around a common vision for the reservation

The scope of the plan includes:

- Inventory and analysis of existing conditions
- Development of Management Recommendations
- Implementation Plan identifying Early Action Projects
- Maintenance Plan

The RMP may also show a need for additional planning or design around a specific management goal. This might include Master Planning.

Schedule

The current schedule has been provided on the back of tonight's agenda.

At each milestone of this project DCR will be looking for public input, both through the work of the Working Group and through other public meetings such as this one

You can see that we expect to see the draft Resource Management Plan in late January/early February

Parallel to the planning process will be the identification and design of early action projects.

By fall of 2006 we expect to have a completed Resource Management Plan ready for adoption by the DCR Stewardship Council AND completed designs for early action projects.

Working Group

This public participation process is supplemented by meetings of a Working Group.

The Working Group is an advisory body made up of a representative from a variety of non-profits, civic and neighborhood groups along with state and local government.

The Working Group met in January to jump start the planning process with a discussion of the future of the Reservation, short and long term goals, management challenges, and the scope of the plan. They also met this September.

DCR appreciates the commitment of the Working Group members.

Management Theme

The consultant, Pressley Associates and their team have been working since July to document the existing conditions at the Reservation and start to identify the issues around recreation, management, maintenance, and resource protection.

Based on the consultant's preliminary findings and the input of the Working Group, DCR has developed this statement which we are calling the Management Theme for the Reservation.

"Chestnut Hill Reservation will be a welcoming, urban oasis that provides safe access to recreation and solitude within a sustainable, natural, and historical landscape. It is a public open space connecting local communities and serving a diverse group of users.

The management of Chestnut Hill Reservation benefits from the support and advocacy of a network of non-profit groups, volunteers, local institutions and civic organizations."

The DCR hopes this statement can evolve into the shared vision for Chestnut Hill Reservation.

PRESENTATION OF PRELIMINARY FINDINGS

MARION PRESSLEY, PRESSLEY ASSOCIATES

Marion Pressley of Pressley Associates followed Mrs. Pearl with a PowerPoint presentation of the Preliminary Findings on the Chestnut Hill RMP. The presentation reviewed the project boundary and scope, issues studied as part of the existing conditions inventory and analysis process, a brief review of the site history, property designations, and the

“Issues and Opportunities.” The topics covered in the “Issues and Opportunities” were Maintenance and Management, Gateways and Circulation, and Landscape Treatment.

DISCUSSION

Following the presentation, the discussion period began with Leslie Luchonok moderating. Verbal questions and comments were taken and responses given by the DCR staff and Marion Pressley.

1. Anatole Zuckerman – ARCA; Mass.Club of Russian Scientists - *When did DCR begin working on this project? How much money has been allocated towards this project? So you’ve spent 6 months and \$125,000, and 4 boards is all you have to show for it?*

DCR began work in December 2004, and the consultant contract awarded in July 2005.

\$125,000 – Leslie ran through the amounts contributed by whom.

Leslie and Marion clarified that the money has not been completely spent to date and that these were not the final products.

2. Dan O’Donnell -*Has not heard anything mentioned about the community garden yet in these presentations, but had heard that a building that is associated with the garden was to remain for this purpose in perpetuity. He would like to see it remain as such. Other concerns include the issues that the community garden has in getting water to the site, and the lack of general/visitor (non-resident permit) parking along Chestnut Hill Drive, and feels this is constricting for visitors.*

Marion indicated that they need more information on the Community Gardens – woman who represents them and is on the working group identified herself (Beverly Ross).

3. Mary MacElroy – *Is there any commitment from the legislature to fund the recommendations from this plan once created?*

Commissioner – no, but assembling this information on the reservation and having a clear picture of our needs will help us work with the legislature. Leslie – It will help DCR begin to address some of the capital improvements.

4. Joseph Teller – *He has seen too many plans drawn that have not been funded, and feels that not having a funding commitment to make improvements will be a disappointment. While it is nice to have design work completed, the lack of a funding component makes implementation chancy, and a commitment to action is needed.*

Marion – as maintenance needs are further expressed, and our ability to address them in house through our staffing and equipment some elements will be able to come to light. Wendy – An operations plan will also include exploring funding opportunities.

Kevin Hollenbeck - the RMP will include small projects (new paving, signs, benches, etc.) that can be accomplished by DCR staff in addition to the larger projects. Kevin needs the RMP to guide him and his staff on these smaller projects.

5. Question from comment card: What are the eyesores mentioned in the presentation.

Marion Pressley - she has her opinions of the eyesores but she is looking for suggestions from the public, particularly in regards to the fence.

6. Joanne Wright – *Two cars are parked on Chestnut Hill Dr that appear to be abandoned. Can they be removed, or do they have to wait for the registration to expire? Can lines be painted in the parking area to assure no loss of parking space due to sloppy parkers?*

Kevin – if the vehicle plates can be submitted to DCR, he will monitor them.

Marion – parking and lines for parking spots will be part of their review.

7. (Russian speaker – Mr. Kryzman?) As translated by Anatole Zuckerman: *To prevent a WWII, we need to remember WWII, and one way to do that is to build a memorial to WWII veterans, so that future generations will know about WWII and this will remind us to be vigilant of future wars.*

8. George Hughes – *It would be nice to review the draft report online before the next public meeting. A website for questions/comments/FAQs would also help tremendously.*

Wendy – the address for the project website can be found on the backside of the agenda. Draft products, future announcements and blank survey forms are also located there. FAQs are a great idea, and may also be posted there.

9. Wendy Barnett – *Other plans that were done in the past – what happened to them and can we see them? With regards to the fence, if it is in disrepair and not functional, I say remove it. Other small projects such as this would be helpful and have visual impact. When do you think you can go to the legislature and request funding? Final comment – her highest priority for the area is safety.*

Marion – the 1977 plan resulted in the fence segment installation, and the playground, but no master plan was completed. The prior plan stated earlier in the discussion was meant in a general way, not specific to this property.

Wendy – probably cannot approach the legislature until the final plan is completed – in the summer of 2006.

Marion estimated that the final plans should be in place by September.

10. Elaine Pierce – *2 comments – 1. She feels the fence is an eyesore given its current condition – she would advocate for its removal as was done at the Brookline reservoir. However she agrees that partial retention to block certain areas from misuse would be helpful, but that it should otherwise be removed. 2. She hopes that the plan will address the wide variety of recreational uses of the reservation and incorporate them.*

11. (Russian speaker – Mr. Bordanka?) As translated by Anatole Zuckerman: *Reminder that this meeting is historic – their group has plans to place a memorial in this park and have the funds to do so. Are you willing to allow us to build our WWII memorial in this park as we have proposed for the past 2 years? Let us remind the state reps and the DCR staff what their role is in serving this community. (Charlie Chaplin quote.) Businessman of the local Russian community can fund this project.*

Eva Webster requested to Leslie that he put a hold on this line of questioning.

Wendy – DCR is developing a policy for all memorials therefore this question cannot be answered at this time while the policy is still in the works.

12. (Roger Blood, Brookline WG Rep) *He would like it to be stated in the plan that this reservoir would not be filled in for any purposes whatsoever.*

13. (Charles River Watershed Association) *What kind of watershed analysis has occurred to date and/or are there plans for any protection as the process moves forward? Maintenance with regard to watershed issues (stormwater, catch basin cleaning, etc.) when will these issues be looked at and start to be implemented?*

Marion – We are looking at these issues and will be addressing them in the recommendations. MWRA can speak to the water quality.

Marianne Connolly – The reservoir is a back up water supply, therefore MWRA is still responsible for water levels and will cooperate with regards to stormwater management recommendations and with DCR as part of the cooperative agreement between these 2 agencies.

14. (woman from the Mass. Club of Russian Scientists) – *Wanted to state that she feels it is wonderful that we can have a public meeting and work towards making decisions together.*
15. John Ellison (a local runner) – *Placing asphalt on the exterior path might help to protect the inside path and direct users to that exterior path. Is there anyway to get Beacon St sidewalk expanded in width to serve people, control traffic and eliminate erosion? Finally, what are the plans for further involvement of BC (given their 25k contribution to this plan) and what is the status of the parcel on Thomas Moore Rd (shaft 7)?*

Marianne Connolly – the MWRA needs this 4 acre parcel and has notified BC of the need to maintain this area for water distribution and supply purposes.

Leslie then stated that any change in use would take a 2/3 votes of the legislature as per Article 97 regulations; no further funding from BC planned.

Marion – question to the crowd – do we even need to maintain these 2 paths? What surface types would be most useful? (She noted that at Jamaica Pond, runners still avoid resilient surface and create more problems.) Surfacing will be looked at and considered with regards to their suitability.

16. Carol Seagle (recreational user) – *Would like to endorse retention of the exterior pathway along Beacon St – and have the drainage problems corrected in the process so that it doesn't flood so much. Two pathways may be needed in some areas, but especially where there are flooding issues. The pathway by Gatehouse #1 and the playground is very overgrown with brush, making it uncomfortable –could this be cleared, but in a way that keeps it naturalistic?*

Marion – a lot of the brush issues will be dealt with through maintenance recommendations.

17. Charlie Vasiliades (WG) – *He would love to see the fence removed. Access to water is his draw to the reservation. He likes community process, and maintaining a naturalistic environment.*
18. Fred Hathaway? (walker) – *Occasionally notices trash – not sure if it is removed by park clean up or it is being tossed into the reservoir. Is junk piling up in the reservoir an issue for water quality?*

Kevin – If you see trash, call him so that it can be picked up. Leslie – to the extent that there is unknown trash is an interesting question – will look into it.

19. Bill Marchione (historical society/working group) – *Are there any plans for 'historic installations' at the reservation? Has there been any consideration of using the high services museum to point people to the reservoir?*

Marion – Regarding interpretive panels, thinks it is an intriguing idea of working with museum or with the gatehouse – feels plenty of information and will include something about interpretation the recommendations.

20. Chris Hayden – *Is crossing Beacon St going to be addressed? He's seen plans of the waterworks office that he hasn't seen presented yet – are they involved? Is use of the reservoir for sailing and/or a boathouse an option?*

Marion – would need to work with cities on that because it is a city street. Plan will likely identify crossing points to recommend to another agency (BRA, cities) and there may be an opportunity to have improved crossing areas come into part of the allocation of the BRA mitigation funds.

Leslie – Yes, the developers of the Waterworks are involved – Merrill Diamond is a member of the working group.

Leslie – Use of the water has been discussed at the working group meetings and will be explored.

21. Jerry Collins – *Wanted to know about the pathway leading from the Comm. Ave apartments into the Reservation – it looks overgrown.*

Marion – Believes it is a right of way – the intent is currently unknown.

Wendy – management decisions will be made based upon information available and potential uses.

A tree behind the Comm. Ave apartment buildings) came down in a storm in 2000 and has been there ever since. Understands that the fencing is required to maintain water quality – perhaps the section along Chestnut Hill Dr is the section is the portion that is maintained? The question regarding funding keeps coming up - does this effect Kevin's time at the reservation and the budget for his management?

Kevin – He manages 12 separate facilities and he divides his time as needed. Leslie – a staffing time analysis will be prepared as part of the recommendations.

22. Eva Webster – *Thanks DCR for their work done to date – felt that the criticisms posed early in the meeting were unwarranted. With regards to the fencing, she has a 19thc lithograph that shows fencing (wood rail) not all the way around but only in key areas – proposed the fence needs to be discussed in depth, possibly time devoted expressly to the issue of the fence by the working group. With regards to the proposed WWII monument, stated that land here has been shrinking and feels that this is not a place for a war monument. With regards to boating, this is an active use and we need to make careful decision to consider all impacts upon wildlife; also a dock would involve BLC approval so it is not an easy task. With tree management, will the plan be looking at removal and additions? There are no trash cans in an area by the rink – DCR needs to keep them there to stem the tide of trash.*

Marion – yes, tree health will be considered heritage trees considered, and they will be looked at with regards to vistas and recreational uses of the reservation.

23. Representative Michael Moran - Two types of questions have arisen – Master Plan questions and Operational questions; DCR is underfunded; His office is open, he is ready to help

WRAP UP/CONCLUSION

WENDY PEARL

At the completion of the discussion period, Mrs. Pearl presented a recap of the schedule. The next Working Group and Public Meetings will be held in early February following the completion of the Draft RMP. She also noted that the Boston Redevelopment Authority will be holding a meeting of the Chestnut Hill Waterworks Impact Advisory Group to discuss mitigation benefits related to the Chestnut Hill Waterworks project. The meeting will be held December 7, 2005, 6:30 pm at the Brighton Marine Health Center. Members of the public are welcome to attend.

PUBLIC MEETING #2

LOCATION: Circle Cinemas

DATE: April 25, 2006

PRESENT: Wendy Pearl, DCR, Project Manager; Leslie Luchonok, DCR, Director, Resource Management Program ; Kevin Hollenbeck, DCR, Supervisor Chestnut Hill Reservation; Lt. Susan Murphy, DCR Ranger; Marion Pressley, Pressley Associates; Gary Claiborne, Pressley Associates; Other DCR staff (External Affairs)

PRESENTATION

The public meeting was started with a brief welcome and introductions by Leslie Luchonok, DCR's Director of the Resource Management Program. Wendy Pearl, Project Manager for the Chestnut Hill RMP then presented an overview of the draft RMP. The presentation was followed by an open discussion period during which participants could speak on microphone or submit written questions/comments on notecards. There were 115 members of the general public in attendance, from which approximately 30 people spoke.

Gary Claiborne of Pressley Associates took notes and the meeting was recorded on audiotape.

DISCUSSION AND COMMENT PERIOD

Following the presentation, members of the audience was asked to present their comments. Note the entire public meeting was recorded on audio tapes by DCR personnel. The following lists the name of each speaker followed by their comments in *italics*. Any response from DCR personnel to the comments are noted in **bold**.

- Cathleen Doury - Resident of 1970 Comm. Ave.
 - *The area is an oasis to live in with the convenience of parking. Removal of parking will affect quality of life and will especially be an issue for seniors. – The Memorial Drive example from the presentation is inappropriate because that area is not residential and serves much more people and uses.*

Leslie Luchonok invited officials to the microphone to provide any opening comments they might like to make.

- Jerry McDermott - Boston City Councillor from Allston/Brighton
 - *Balance improvements with reality. The neighborhood is in need of more parking and existing parking cannot be removed.*
 - *5 MBTA stops were lost in this area d there needs to be a push to restore these T stops.*
 - *Office is willing to work with DCR to advance plan.*
- Jason Giotti- staff member of Representative Moran's office, MA State House
 - *Office has heard lots of comments on parking*
 - *Office will advocate for residents*
 - *Encourages public to take advantage of public comment period*
 - *Requested a show of hands of people here for parking - about 85%*
- Will Luzier – staff member of Senator Tolman's Office
 - *Office opposes parking removal*
 - *Parkway was constructed before automobiles and before the apartment buildings was built.*
 - *Parking removal needs to be taken off the table*
 - *There should be no change in community garden status*
 - *Office is for a formal agreement with gardeners*
- George Chapman - staff member from Representative Smizik's Office, Brookline
 - *Here to listen to be sure the process works*
 - *Office will work closely with DCR*

- Dan Flannagan – staff member from Representative Kevin Honan’s Office
 - *Office is open for comments from the public*

Comments were then opened to the general audience.

- Chris Radray – resident of 1970 Commonwealth Avenue
 - *Security should be a major issue*
 - *There are lots of troublemakers behind apartments. Park closure should be enforced.*
- Rita McMillan – nurse in the community and member of the Community Garden
 - *Garden was originally the “park”*
 - *Garden is a true community fellowship*
- Judge Norman Weinberg - Wade St. resident for 60 years, former member of Massachusetts Legislature
 - *Not informed of meeting until late and wonders why people were not properly notified*
 - *Disappointed with lack of public input in the RMP*
 - *Overall it is a good plan, with the exceptions of the garden and parking*
 - *Knows history of area well. He was instrumental in relocation of garden and the rehabilitation of Chestnut Hill Driveway in the 1970’s. MDC agreed to location of garden.*
 - *Before the Chestnut Hill Driveway reconstruction, there was no lighting and no proper drainage. It used to be a “lovers lane.” He helped to plan the existing parking and the “jogging track” around the Reservoir (referring to the Outer Pathway). The “track” received lots of use but no maintenance after installation. The pre-1977 parking was chaotic. Concerned of where cars will go if DCR removes the existing parking. Pre-1977, lots of parking occurred on Wade Street. Questions the loss of view to the inconvenience of parking removal.*
- Michael Bloom
 - *Parking is a public safety issue*
 - *Removal will mean walking to far for some people*
 - *Removal of cobblestones will increase speed on Driveway*
 - *Those who park on Driveway are also Reservation users*
- Daniel O’Donnell
 - *Resident-only signs only installed a couple of years ago*
 - *Would agree to a restoration to fully open parking*
 - *Keep garden*
 - *Tone down entire plan*
 - *Concerned about \$1 million GH #1 re-use budget versus the need of the rest of the Reservation*
 - *Also at issue with the historic benches, lights, and path change. Believe it is too much money.*
 - *There is no geese problem, more swans than geese*
 - *RMP is not consistent in looking at grass and understory issues.*
 - *10’ is too wide for a path around Reservoir.*
 - *Control the grounds for safety and trash.*
- Richard Varney – resident of 960 Commonwealth Avenue
 - *Against loss of parking spaces*
 - *Already worried about leave home at night and losing parking space.*
- Iliona Paris – resident of 1960 Commonwealth Avenue (around 10 years)
 - *Happy with possible Reservation renovation*
 - *Opposes parking removal*
 - *Public safety should be a major issue (currently there is a safety alert due to some recent robberies)*
 - *Not allowed to park at several open lots which are available at most all time (Boston College, Saint Elizabeth’s, etc.)*
- Gerald Collins – member of Working Group, Reservoir Garden Condominium representative
 - *Opposes parking removal*
 - *Has petition against removal of parking (around 30 signatures, mostly condo residents)*
 - *Parking is an established policy*
 - *Uncomfortable that parking removal issue will not come up again in future even if it is dropped today*
 - *Want to negotiate an agreement to make parking permanent*

- **Wendy Pearl's response – 2/3 legislative vote required to release park land – it is accessibility issue, parking is not an isolated issue but part of the whole Driveway**
- **Leslie Luchonok's response – a parking committee may be a good idea**
- Questions from cards which are not related to parking issue:
 - *Remove fence in front of WaterWorks and replace with a hedge*
 - *What is the influence of WaterWorks on RMP process?*
 - *What about Boston College support of plan? – Wendy Pearl responded that Boston College and the WaterWorks contributed*
 - *What is the amount of the RMP contract? – Wendy Pearl responded that \$125,000 is allocated to Pressley Associates, including design work on early action project(s)*
- Abigail Fury – Member of Working Group
 - *Parking – it was only last summer that resident-only parking was implemented*
 - *It is 3 hour parking only at the “loop”*
 - *Parking is not privatization – it is paid for by taxpayers*
 - *The community garden is beloved.*
 - *Want a plan that everyone will be happy with.*
- Pat Diamond – Member of Community Garden for 10 years
 - *There are other community gardens on DCR lands. What are the existing agreements with these gardens?*
 - **Wendy Pearl: The Southwest Corridor gardens are under permits, but this use is still being investigated. Issues regarding liability and long term use of land**
 - *There is no permanent water supply at garden. Can DCR help?*
 - **Leslie Luchonok – There are lots of question that cannot be answered at this meeting**
 - *There are actually “private property” signs on Commonwealth Avenue buildings*
- Resident of 1984 Commonwealth Avenue
 - *Bought condo because of visitor parking*
- John Ellis - resident of 1982 Commonwealth Avenue
 - *What is the issue with accessibility along the Driveway*
 - **Wendy Pearl: the path dipping below the retaining wall is not accessible. There is no universally accessible path. One of the DCR's missions is to allow access and more land along the Driveway is needed to allow accessibility.**
 - *State that there seems to be confusion about pathway issues*
 - *The Beacon Street pathway need rehabilitation – Wendy Pearl: This is a City sidewalk.*
 - *What is the role of Boston College in the future? Response by Jeanne Levesque (Boston College): BC will be offering comments as abutters to the Reservation property.*
- Eva Webster – member of Working Group
 - *MWRA still in control of Gatehouse #1 parking lot area. Horrified by new staging area there. Is this is public parklands? RMP calls this area as gateway to park.*
 - *Jogging path - concerned with 1-paths system and sees this as an issue in winter.*
 - *The Outer Path, whether city sidewalk or not, it is part of the system. Must take the macro-view and not just look within boundaries of Reservation.*
 - *Soft versus hard paths. Hard path needed in winter*
 - *Dual path should remain with 1 path soft and 1 path hard*
 - *Playground use should be considered. It is useful for skating rink users (younger siblings). Leaving playground is better than removal*
 - *Wants removal of fence at dam with plantings to keep people off.*
 - *For the Impact Advisory group, \$100,000 was committed to fence removal, not “treatment”*
 - **Wendy Pearl – The staging area is for the Heath Hill Project. MWRA is staging for a 2 mile pipeline. Area will be in use until Oct. 2007, but MWRA may negotiate with contractor for stabilization of Gatehouse #1.**
 - *Eva – Vegetation Management plan is not a component of RMP. This Vegetation Management plan is necessary to guide vegetation maintenance*
- Sharon Kelley
 - *Plant more trees with plantings on the dam*
 - *Keep parking*

- Lisa Clark - resident of 1980 Commonwealth Avenue
 - *For swans and geese and increased access to parking*
 - *Redesign Driveway for pathways and parking*
 - *For the dual path*
 - *Consultants should learn something from cut-thru paths*
 - *Not all access points need be accessible*
- Margaret Hern – resident of 1970 Commonwealth Avenue
 - *How many spaces need to be removed for accessibility? Wendy Pearl: +/- 30 spaces*
 - *Where will money come from? Wendy Pearl: Resources not yet available – capital project money will be needed for Driveway. RMP is a long term vision for Park.*
- Leyland Webster- Brighton
 - *Cited historical photo of dam with no fence.*
 - *Concerned with institutional expansion and involvement of Boston College and others in future?*
Leslie Luchonok – Boston College has no special access to the DCR. They are allowed to comment just like others.
- Justin Billard – resident of 1990 Commonwealth Avenue
 - *Wants RMP to go forward*
 - *Garden should not be a management issue and there is no need for micromanagement by DCR.*
 - *Regarding parking, we need to move forward, not back into history. There is no abuse of parking and cars will be forced elsewhere.*
 - *Gatehouse #1 should be made into an office for staff, not a concessionaire.*
 - *Rumble strips should remain.*
- Philip Krodee
 - *Has issue with MBTA stop removals along the B line.*
 - *Realizes this is not part of project*
- Adrianna - 11 year old resident of Wade Street
 - *Has a Community garden plot and wants it to remain.*
- Andrew Fisher - Brookline Precinct 13
 - *Disappointed at the wish list nature of the RMP. It is not realistic with current state budget issues.*
Leslie Luchonok – The RMP reinforces DCR transparency to the public.
 - *The Driveway is the property of park and should not be a parking lot.*
 - *Lease/sale of the Rink in public parkland is a concern.*
 - **Response by Joe O’Keefe – DCR Environmental Affairs Office – There will be no long term lease without legislative agreement. Governor Romney is pushing leasing and not a sale of state property. There will need to be an infusion of capital money to restore rink (+- \$15 million). A lease should be considered a win/win for neighborhood.**
- Michelle Hanss- Working Group Member
 - *Speaking as a pedestrian*
 - *Issues with pedestrian crossing across St. Thomas More Road at Beacon Street and across Beacon Street to Gatehouse #2. Install a blinking traffic light?*
 - *Pushes a vegetation management plan. Look at the Houghton Garden agreement.*
- Dan Healey – resident of 1980 Commonwealth Avenue
 - *Parking is a quality of life issue.*
 - *Wants DCR to take parking removal off the table and will hold off on rest of RMP until this happens.*
- Jeff Grove
 - *Pro-community garden*
 - *If rumble strips are removed, replace them with speed bumps.*
- Danielle Goyet - resident of 1992 Commonwealth Avenue
 - *Improve accessibility at Driveway by regarding the path below the retaining wall.*
- Steve McQuire
 - *Use the entry at Gatehouse #1 as the primary entrance for accessibility.*